

[27th March 1929]

Recommendations or remarks.

Action taken.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>10. Forensic medicine is taught entirely by lectures. There is no practical work.</p> <p>11. The staffs of the college and the hospitals are provided from the Madras Medical Department; the system is unsatisfactory; it restricts the field of recruitment and in practice involves too frequent changes in staff.</p> <p>12. The standards of attainment required in the 1st M.B., Part I of 2nd M.B. and Part I of Final M.B. Examinations should be equal to the standards required in the remaining subjects. The marks required for all the clinical parts should be 50 per cent.</p> | <p>10. Arrangements have been made to supplement the lectures by practical demonstrations embracing examination of dead bodies, museum specimens, blood and seminal stains, hair and fibres and tests for poisons.</p> <p>11. The need for the training of specialists for the teaching appointments has been recognized. The question is being examined by a committee appointed to consider certain matters connected with the future of medical education in the Presidency.</p> <p>12. This recommendation has been given effect to in the revised regulations adopted by the Madras University with effect from the 1st July 1928.</p> |
|--|---|

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to question No. 2002 asked by Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 27th March 1929, page 974 supra.]

To

The President,

Chingleput District Board,

Saidapet.

Sir,

We, the following members of the Chingleput District Board, send our note of dissent against the resolution passed at the District Board meeting held on 31st January 1929 to take action against Rao Bahadur J. Chelvaranga Raju, District Board Member, for his writing an article in the *Hindu* on the damage caused to the Uthukota causeway.

As the District Board has not taken legal advice from the Advocate-General on this matter, and if a case is launched for defamation without obtaining such advice, the money spent out of the District Board funds will be a loss if the case fails. Hence we give our note of dissent on this action.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servants,

(Signed)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

Madras, 21st January 1929.

District Board Members.